

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of August 30, 2005, has been considered by the Applicants. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 21 have been amended. Claims 1-9 and 21 are pending. Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

In paragraph 6, the Examiner stated the conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) had not been met because the provisional application (Application '866) did not provide an adequate written description of the subject matter recited in the instant claims. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's assessment here, reference to the provisional application has been removed from the specification in order to expedite allowance of the present application.

In paragraph 7, item 1, the Examiner objected to a capitalization error in the amended paragraph. The paragraph has been amended again to capitalize the trademarked word TEFLON.

In paragraph 7, item 2, the Examiner objected to the drawing of the charge transport compound of Formula (II) and requested that the bonds on the left side of the chemical formula be clearly attached to the 1 and 4 positions of the phenylenes group. The chemical formula has been amended to do so.

In paragraph 8, the Examiner noted that claims 6 and 7 were substantial duplicates. Claim 6 has been amended to recite a "3-methylphenyl" instead of a "4-methylphenyl." This recitation was inadvertently changed in a prior amendment. The 3-methylphenyl has basis in original claim 6. Claims 6 and 7 now are not duplicative.

In paragraph 9, the Examiner objected to the chemical structure shown in Formula (II) in claims 1 and 21. The chemical formula has been amended.

Applicants request withdrawal of these objections.

In paragraph 11, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2, as indefinite. Applicants traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated that one of the listed carbonates was not a bisphenol A polycarbonate. Claim 8 has been amended to recite only "polycarbonate" instead of "bisphenol A polycarbonate". This change also has support in the paragraph beginning at page 16, line 21 of the specification. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

In paragraph 13, claims 1-9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants believe this rejection is based on the two different chemical structures, the one from the provisional application and the one in the original specification, which have been used in the claims. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 21 to select the chemical structure in the original specification. That chemical compound has an adequate written description because R1-R6 are described for that chemical structure. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, all pending claims (claims 1-9, 21) are in condition for allowance. No additional search or examination is believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, she is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at telephone number 216-861-5582, Cleveland, OH.

It is believed that no fee is due in conjunction with this response. If, however, it is determined that fees are due, authorization is hereby given for deduction of those fees, other than the issue fees, from Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH
& McKEE LLP



Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 861-5582